

Appln. No. 10/782,145  
Amendment dated April 28, 2008  
Reply to Office Action mailed January 28, 2008

### REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 5, 7 through 9, 11, 13, and 15 through 18, 20 and 21 remain in this application. Claims 6, 10, 12, 14, and 19 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

#### Part 1 of the Office Action

The term "RV" throughout the claims have been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

All claims containing the term "RV" have been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language. Specifically,

Withdrawal of the objection to claims 17 and 20 is therefore respectfully requested.

#### Parts 2 and 3 of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 through 9 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wyse.

Claims 3, 13, 17 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyse in view of Johnson.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, requires "wherein each of said plurality of leg members is movable between a storage position and a support position, said storage position being characterized by said leg member *being positioned substantially parallel to and abutted against one of said lateral extents and being oriented substantially perpendicular to one of said longitudinal extents*, said support position being characterized by

Appln. No. 10/782,145  
Amendment dated April 28, 2008  
Reply to Office Action mailed January 28, 2008

said leg member *being positioned substantially perpendicular to said one lateral extent and being positioned perpendicular to one of said longitudinal extents*".

The Johnson patent shows a panel on which the leveling jacks are mounted, without any longitudinal extents or lateral extents, so the Johnson patent cannot disclose the relationships set forth in the claim language.

It is submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Wyse and Johnson set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claims 3, 13 and 21. Further, claim 17, which depends from claim 13, also includes the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 5, 7 through 9, 11, and 21 therefore respectfully requested.

**Paragraph 4 of the Office Action**

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action states that claims 14 through 16 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claim 14 into claim 13, and therefore claim 13, as well as claims 15, 16 and 17, which depend from claim 13, are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Appln. No. 10/782,145  
Amendment dated April 28, 2008  
Reply to Office Action mailed January 28, 2008

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date:



Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)

Customer No. **40,158**

P.O. Box 5027

Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027

(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357